

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action transmitted April 10, 2008 (“*Office Action*”). Claims 1-31 are pending in the Application, and the Examiner rejects all pending claims. Applicants amend Claims 25-30 but do not add new matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejects Claims 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 25-30. Although Applicants believe that all previously pending claims recite statutory subject matter under § 101, to advance this case expeditiously to issuance, Applicants have amended Claims 25-30. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 25-30 under § 101 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,847,618 to Laursen, et al. (“*Laursen*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,445 to Kumar, et al. (“*Kumar*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that *Laursen* and *Kumar*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combination of limitations recited in the claims.

Consider Applicants’ independent Claim 1, which recites:

A method for supporting communications comprising:
establishing a communications conference, the communications conference including a plurality of conference participants, each conference participant providing an audio stream;
identifying audio data packets in the audio streams;
mixing audio information from selected ones of the audio data packets to generate a conference audio stream;
communicating the conference audio stream to the conference participants;
identifying enhanced media packets embedded in at least one of the audio streams; and
communicating the enhanced media packets to selected ones of the conference participants.

Among other aspects, *Laursen* and *Kumar*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “identifying enhanced media packets embedded in at least one of the audio streams,” as Claim 1 requires.

Claim 1 recites “identifying enhanced media packets embedded in at least one of the audio streams.” As teaching these claimed aspects, the *Office Action* relies on *Kumar*, column 5, line 60 to column 4, line 18. In the cited portion, *Kumar* provides that “the MP of the MCU 220 multicasts the resulting audio and video streams on the RTP/RTCP audio and video sessions 252 and 254, respectively.” Col. 4, ll. 26-29. There is no disclosure in *Kumar* that enhanced media packets are embedded in at least one of the audio streams. Rather, *Kumar* teaches multicasting audio and video streams on audio and video sessions, respectively. *See Kumar*, col. 4, ll. 26-29. Accordingly, *Kumar* fails to teach or suggest “identifying enhanced media packets embedded in at least one of the audio streams,” as Claim 1 requires. *Laursen* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Kumar*, and the Examiner agrees. *See Office Action*, p. 4 (“*Laursen* fails to disclose identifying enhanced media packets embedded in at least one of the audio streams.”).

Independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 25, and 31 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught by *Laursen* and *Kumar*. Because *Laursen* and *Kumar* do not teach or suggest every element of independent Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 and their respective dependent claims.

In addition to being allowable as described above, Claim 19 is also allowable because the cited reference fails to disclose “a computing device coupled to the telephony device,” which is recited by Claim 19. As teaching these aspects, the *Office Action* relies on *Laursen*’s Figure 1, elements 105 and 155. *Office Action*, p. 7. In the cited figure, however, there is no disclosure that computer client 155 is coupled to telephony client 105. At a minimum, *Laursen* fails to teach or suggest “a computing device coupled to the telephony device,” as Claim 19 requires. *Kumar* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Laursen*. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 19 and its respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this Application.

If the Examiner feels prosecution of the present Application may be advanced by a telephone conference, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at (214) 953-6584.

Although no fees are believed to be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER/BOTTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40,227

Date: July 10, 2008

Customer No. **05073**